

S 3492

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 14, 1982

and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons. Be it further

*Resolved* that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota is directed to transmit certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the State of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress.

**CONTROL OF UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION AND THE DUMPING OF SPECIALTY STEELS IN THE UNITED STATES MARKETS**

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Resolution No. 149 of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which has been received in the office of the President pro tempore, and which relates to control of unfair foreign competition and the dumping of specialty steels in the U.S. markets.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 149**

Whereas, Specialty steels are an essential industrial material and, therefore, the domestic industry is a strategic resource necessary to national defense; and

Whereas, The United States can, and must, maintain an adequate level of self-sufficiency and production capability in specialty steels, including a skilled and adequate labor force; and

Whereas, The economic base of the specialty steel industry has been seriously eroded in recent years by the damaging flow of imports of specialty steels and products containing these materials; and

Whereas, Under pressure of excessive imports, unemployment has climbed as high as forty percent in the specialty steel industry during recent years; and

Whereas, American privately-owned specialty steel producers compete in the marketplace with foreign companies which are government-owned, subsidized, or directed and do not have to meet the disciplines of our free-market system; and

Whereas, The specialty steel industry has always favored development of open, fair, and mutually beneficial world trade—it is not protectionist; and

Whereas, The problem of assuring that foreign companies compete fairly and legally confronts the specialty steel industry, many other industries, and our entire economy. As the major open-world market, our Nation faces industrial stagnation—reduced job opportunities—and a declining standard of living, unless new understandings and rules relating to trade can be developed with foreign governments; and

Whereas, The specialty steel industry is experiencing massive layoffs due to the unfair dumping of foreign specialty steel; and

Whereas, Unfair competition and the dumping of foreign steels in United States markets is causing substantial and lasting hardship for Pennsylvania citizens employed in the specialty steel industry; therefore be it

*Resolved (the Senate concurring),* That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the

President of the United States, the Congress, and the International Trade Commission to take prompt and aggressive action to control unfair foreign competition and the dumping of specialty steels in the United States markets; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, each member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the International Trade Commission, along with its United States trade representative, and the Department of Commerce.

**A COWBOY'S PRAYER**

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has brought a pleasant new dimension to our floor proceedings with his weekly reading of a selected poem. Through this practice, which he started last October, Senator BAKER gives recognition to famous and lesser known poets and provides some pleasurable passages for the RECORD which, as we all know, can often be ponderous.

Today I would like to follow Senator BAKER's fine example by offering for the RECORD a poem by South Dakota's cowboy poet Badger Clark.

Clark was born in Albia, Iowa, in 1883, but his family moved to Dakota Territory when he was an infant and Clark grew up in the Black Hills, in the boisterous town of Deadwood. As a youth he journeyed to Cuba and lived for a few years on the Caribbean isle before returning to the States to work on a ranch in Arizona, near the Mexican border. He began to write easy-going Western rhymes for pure pleasure during these years in Arizona cowboy country. He was later surprised at how readily his poems were accepted for publication by newspapers and magazines.

Clark returned to his home State while still a young man, settling down in Hot Springs, in the southern Black Hills of South Dakota. He continued to write lyrical verse about the big sky, vast reaches of land, and above all the freedom of the "wild west." He was soon named poet laureate of South Dakota, a post he held until his death in 1957.

Two books of Clark's poems were published in the early 1900's. The first "Sun and Saddle Leather," appeared in 1915 and was reprinted several times; the second "Grass Grown Trails," was published in 1917. A third book of poems, "Sky Lines and Wood Smoke," was published in 1935. The copyright on this volume was held by Francis Case, a former distinguished member of the U.S. Senate from South Dakota.

Clark was a deeply religious man, but he eschewed starched collars and coats and was more comfortable by a campfire than in church. This is clear in one of his most famous works, "A Cowboy's Prayer."

Clark once commented on the wide popularity of this sincere and simple poem. "I didn't really intend for the pious cowboy to become a revivalist,"

he said, "but it isn't likely that a little religious emotion will hurt anybody in America just now." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this poem by Badger Clark be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**A COWBOY'S PRAYER**

(By Badger Clark)

Oh, Lord, I've never lived where churches grow. I love creation better as it stood  
That day You finished it so long ago And looked upon Your work and called it good.

I know that others find You in the light  
That's sifted down through tinted window panes,

And yet I seem to feel You near tonight In this dim, quiet starlight on the plains.

I thank You, Lord, that I am placed so well,  
That You have made my freedom so complete;

That I'm no slave of whistle, clock or bell,  
Nor weak-eyed prisoner of wall and street.

Just let me live my life as I've begun And give me work that's open to the sky;

Make me a partner of the wind and sun,  
And I won't ask a life that's soft or high.

Let me be easy on the man that's down; Let me be square and generous with all.

I'm careless sometimes, Lord; when I'm in town, But never let 'em say I'm mean or small!

Make me as big and open as the plains, As honest as the hawse between by knees.

Clean as the wind that blows behind the rains, Free as the hawk that circles down the breeze!

Forgive me, Lord, if sometimes I forget. You know about the reasons that are hid.

You understand the things that gall and fret; You know me better than my mother did.

Just keep an eye on all that's done and said And right me, sometimes, when I turn aside,

And guide me on the long, dim trail ahead That stretches upward toward the Great Divide.

**ELIZABETH DOLE: "A CLEAR MANDATE TO REBUILD OUR DEFENSES"**

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, during the recess, on April 2, 1982, Elizabeth H. Dole, Assistant to the President for Public Liaison, addressed the National Rifle Association's annual dinner in Philadelphia.

Incidentally, this marked the first time in the 111-year history of the NRA that a woman addressed this banquet.

During her remarks, Mrs. Dole succinctly outlined the administration's position in what she called: "The President's effort to halt the rush to doomsday."

She pointed out to the NRA delegates the importance of the administration's priorities in the defense area saying:

The American people expressed their concern about our future course fifteen months ago. They elected President Reagan with a clear mandate to rebuild our defenses. And the President has responded with a series of



April 14, 1982

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 3493

decisions designed to ward off the would-be aggressors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Dole's entire remarks be printed in the RECORD so that the country can have the benefit of her views.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ELIZABETH HANFORD DOLE

I'm deeply honored by your invitation to make history as the first woman to address an NRA banquet in 111 years. Perhaps that is because, as one who has spent the last ten years working in government, I've learned all about that "arsenal of bureaucracy" in Washington, D.C. As a White House staff member, who reads the daily newspapers in our nation's capital, I also know something about potshots, light weapons and heavy artillery.

Before leaving for Philadelphia today, the President asked me to convey his best wishes for a successful event and his deep thanks for your support. I don't need to tell you how proud he is to be a card-carrying member of the National Rifle Association. He's asked me several times to make sure you are taking good care of his rifle, presented to him by several of your leaders in an Oval Office ceremony last December and now showcased in your museum.

There's a story about a distinguished looking gentleman who entered a fashionable New York sporting goods store and asked to see some shotguns. The clerk, sizing him up as a man of means, brought out a handsome English model priced over \$4,000. "It's a splendid gun," the customer said, "but a little expensive for what I have in mind."

So the clerk went out and fetched a Belgian weapon, with a price tag of \$650. "Still a little too dear for me," the customer told him. This time the clerk brought back a Winchester mass production stock model, priced at \$119.95. A smile broke out the customer's face at last. "That will do just perfectly," he told the clerk. "After all, it's only a small wedding."

Now, Washington, D.C. is a place where shotgun weddings take place all the time—but not, I hasten to add, for Bob and me. And certainly not between the Reagan Administration and this organization. In fact, you have been the President's staunch ally in many causes, above all in the freedom of the American people to live their own lives without interference or dictation from Washington. It has never been a marriage of convenience—but a partnership of people who share the same objectives and nurture the same hopes for America.

Nowhere is this more so than in the Constitutionally guaranteed right to bear arms. I would remind you of the words contained in the 1980 Republican platform—the credo of the party and the President now in office . . .

"We believe the right of citizens to keep and bear arms must be preserved. Accordingly, we oppose federal registration of firearms. Mandatory sentences for commission of armed felonies are the most effective means to deter abuse of this right. We, therefore, support Congressional initiatives to remove those provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 that do not significantly impact on crime but serve rather to restrain the law-abiding citizen in his legitimate use of firearms."

I need hardly add that this plank was strongly supported by the President as well as by Senator James McClure, co-sponsor of the McClure-Volkmer Bill.

The President feels the time is past when government can expect to harass its own

citizenry. It is the President's view that the time has come to write a prohibition on such activities into law—and make it stick. The President believes that we can protect law abiding gun owners while at the same time cracking down on criminals involved in the illegal use of firearms.

That, of course, is but one of many priorities you and this Administration have in common. Together, we envisage an America where government is once more the people's servant, and not their master. We see an America where people can afford to enjoy the fruits of their labor—instead of surrendering that bounty to the voracious appetite of tax collectors and bureaucratic regulators.

In the last 15 months, President Reagan has done much to make that vision become reality. Thanks to his leadership—and thanks to the vocal support of millions of citizens like yourselves—we are giving this country back to the people who made it great, and defended it bravely. We have launched the greatest relief program ever—for the American taxpayer. We are putting \$750 billion back into your pockets—and we are entrusting you to make the decisions that will move your economy off dead-center.

We have finally begun to tighten the belt on Washington—while continuing to care for those in genuine need. For any who doubt that commitment, I would call their attention to the 95 million Americans who will eat a federally-subsidized meal tomorrow—or the 7 million college students aided by federal dollars in pursuit of a degree—that's 7 million out of a total of 11 million—or the one million aspiring jobholders being trained with federal funds—or the 3½ million who live in federally-subsidized housing.

This Administration is not playing partisan politics—only accepting the honest fact that government can no longer spend with reckless abandon. We are cutting taxes—cutting the rate of growth in spending—reducing excessive regulation—and pursuing a stable economic climate within which to make plans. We are doing all this because the old ways have failed. And because we want something better than paternalism for the poor—we want to offer them a hand up not just a hand out. We want a hardpressed middle class to keep more of what it earns. As they grow to adulthood, we want our children to have the same opportunity to enjoy the independence that comes with self-support.

Most of all, we want them to inherit a world at peace, where no one rattles a sword and no one drags a chain. And that brings me to yet another priority which you and this administration share.

Perhaps no audience in America understands the distinction between defensive and offensive weapons better than this one. Surely, none has been more generous in its support for an America whose defense is adequate to her needs. For you understand that great nations must shoulder great responsibilities. They must be willing to spend dollars for defense, unless they want to spill blood on some distant battle field. You understand the difference between outlaws and the law-abiding—not only in our own neighborhoods, but in the global community. You understand strength as a deterrent to wrongdoers. And you have never hesitated to go public with that realistic assessment of the dangerous world in which we live.

And so it is, that this evening, in the midst of a worldwide debate on arms and arms control, I would like to spend a few minutes on this country's position—and this President's efforts to halt the rush to doomsday.

On Wednesday night, President Reagan issued a call to both sides on the nuclear divide to sit down and negotiate genuine and lasting, verifiable reductions in the atomic arsenals accumulated since the end of World War II. He endorsed the Jackson-Warner resolution which seeks a reduction in such weapons, and an easing of tensions among the nuclear superpowers. In concert with our European allies, the United States is sitting at a negotiating table in Vienna this very minute—working toward a reduction of conventional weapons on that ancient continent twice ravaged by war in this century. At talks in Geneva, we have already proposed to the Soviets the elimination of all intermediate-range missiles. And soon, perhaps as early as this summer, we will embark on a new round of talks, in an effort to hasten a return to the civilized behavior the President recalled in his remarks Wednesday night.

But negotiation, like marriage, takes two. It has little hope of success without incentives for both sides to negotiate in good faith. No one more than Ronald Reagan hopes for an early end to the endless stockpiling of weaponry. But to freeze weapons at their existing imbalance would achieve nothing but a global stamp of approval on the Soviets' nuclear superiority. Or, to use a domestic comparison, it would be the ultimate example of taking guns away from those who have them only for self-defense—while leaving them bristling in the trigger-happy hands of international lawbreakers.

There is nothing new in the desire to spend less on national defense. During a debate on the subject in 1789, in our constitutional convention held not far from this hall, one delegate got to his feet and moved that "the standing army be restricted to 5,000 men at any one time." This prompted George Washington, as presiding officer, to suggest an amendment of his own—to provide that no foreign enemy shall invade the United States with more than 3,000 troops at any time.

Freezing an imbalance of arms would be just about as effective as that original freeze on the size of standing armies. It would put pressure on this country and little or none on the Soviets. It would not materially advance the cause of nuclear disarmament—on the contrary, it would all but destroy the justification for any genuine arms reduction. No—the nuclear status quo is too deadly to enshrine permanently. President Reagan understands that thoroughly, and that is why he is inviting the Soviets to invest more commitment and less propaganda in stemming the arms spiral.

The Soviets claim to harbor strictly defensive notions. Tell that to the people of Afghanistan. Tell it to the residents of Warsaw and Gdansk. In fact, this "strictly defensive" military machine has been expanding at an alarming rate for the past 15 years. As a land power, you wouldn't think that Soviet defense requires maritime superiority—yet that's what they've spent tens of billions of dollars to achieve. Equipped with a land army already considerably larger than our own, you wouldn't think that Soviet defense would require adding scores of fresh divisions and four times as many tanks—and yet that's exactly what they've done. As a nation saddled with economic woes, whose people are deprived of consumer goods and basic necessities, you wouldn't think that Soviet defense alone could justify spending \$85 billion more than the United States over the last ten years. And yet, that's exactly what they've done.

And what have they gotten for their money? An empire whose cracks are showing. A guerilla war in the rugged mountains



S 3494

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 14, 1982

of Afghanistan. An expansive solar system of economically impoverished satellites. And rising hostility wherever people value freedom and the opportunity to create a better life for themselves. The Soviets portray their military buildup as a necessary response—a circling of the wagons, if you will, to protect the motherland from hostile forces ranged around her borders. In fact, their paranoia is directed less at outside forces than those within. The only thing greater than their fear is their ambition. And so it is that the Reagan Administration finds itself confronted with a drastically different balance of power than anything known in the last twenty-five years.

Those pacifists who march in European streets have an understandable interest in protecting their homelands from a nuclear holocaust. But they must not forget in their zeal for peace that it is not strength but weakness which tempts the aggressor. They of all people should understand the lessons of Munich and the locust years that followed. And they should likewise grasp the dangers of a world in which the United States lowers, not only her voice, but also her flag. We, no less than they, must come to terms with a world in which American resolve is all that stands between a tense balance and a global reign of terror. Either we accept that burden, or we place every value we hold dear in peril.

The American people expressed their own concern about our future course 15 months ago. They elected President Reagan with a clear mandate to rebuild our defenses. And the President has responded with a series of decisions designed to ward off would-be aggressors.

The strategic package he announced last September can close the window of vulnerability which we otherwise would have faced—if we proceed to strengthen our strategic forces year after year as planned and urged by the President.

His decisions on the modernization of major nuclear forces were based on a similar long-term view. He had to choose not just one new weapon system, but several major components at the same time.

For the sad but inescapable truth is that virtually every part of our strategic forces is in need of both modernization and strengthening. The Minuteman system for missile basing was decided on more than 20 years ago. The mainstay of our present bomber force, the B-52, was chosen some 30 years ago, forcing our pilots to fly planes older than themselves. The only comparable across-the-board review of strategic force needs occurred back in 1955, when Dwight Eisenhower was in the White House, and the U.S. decided to proceed with the ICBM and new system for bomber basing and air defense.

Much has been said about the U.S. military build-up. What exactly, does it consist of? Basically, it contains five mutually reinforcing elements:

First—We plan long neglected improvements in our command and control systems. This will enable us to better operate all parts of the triad: land, sea and air.

Second—We will modernize our strategic bomber fleet to replace our 30-year-old B-52's, so we can continue to have an ability to penetrate Soviet air defenses by manned bombers.

Third—We will deploy new, heavier, and far more accurate submarine-launched ballistic missiles—in many ways, the most survivable of all defense systems.

Fourth—We will undertake a step-by-step plan to improve the strength and accuracy of the new MX land-based missiles (which are far more accurate and which carry 10

warheads apiece). We will also seek out ways to reduce the vulnerability of the MX.

Fifth—We will improve our strategic defenses as yet another means of discouraging and deterring attack.

We will not neglect our conventional capabilities—far from it. We intend to place special emphasis on those areas which have suffered the most during the long years when our defenses were allowed to decay. That means improving the overall readiness, sustainability, and modernization of our forces. It means bolstering our military's ability to respond to conventional challenges. It means getting on with the unglamorous yet critical task of providing more spare parts, more ammunition, more fuel and more training so that those who must be proficient in the use of weapons can have the time they need to develop their skills properly.

In rebuilding our land forces, we will not neglect those who fly our flag on the vast oceans and the inland seas. For access to the seas is vital if we are to protect our interests abroad as well as the crucial lines of supply that now bring us scarce materials from all over the world. A strong Navy is the only way to insure this ability—and we are rebuilding ours so that it will be very strong indeed. We are upgrading the rapid deployment force.

And we are finally rewarding our men and women in uniform with more than pretty words and empty gestures. Last October, our military personnel received a pay raise of 14.3%. It was long overdue, and well-deserved. And it's no coincidence that the President not long ago was able to announce that all four services have met their manpower quotas for the first time since the all-volunteer force was introduced in 1973.

Because of the President's leadership in changing our national attitudes about those who serve, recognition of military service for what it is—the protection of our freedom—and appreciation for the men and women who perform those jobs is growing as rapidly as is their level of pay. Our enlistment and reenlistment rates are significantly improved. The importance of this cannot be exaggerated. Because history has proved again and again, that the tenacity, and character of a nation is reflected in those who wear its uniform and carry its arms.

I would be remiss if I did not point out a myth that is being perpetrated by our detractors—that we are taking social dollars to fund weapons. One needs only to look at the record to see that today's Defense Department expenditures account for 28.5% of the Federal budget and 6.3% of GNP. In the 1950's and '60's, defense was between 40-50% of the budget and between 8-9% of GNP. And in the intervening years, Soviets have spent half again as much as the U.S. on military—defense claims 6% of our GNP and 15% in the USSR. This President is tackling the problems of cost and clearly understands the need for increased efficiency and effectiveness. As he said in his Wednesday night press conference, he looks forward to the recommendations of his citizens task force, which will review the Defense Department with a fine-tooth comb. Already, some progress has been made in controlling waste.

For example, the Pentagon has obtained congressional approval to commit funds for several years, rather than in the traditional year-by-year approach. This one reform will save the taxpayers over \$300 million this year alone. It is also working with American industry to realize economies from large lot buying, more efficient scheduling of production facilities, and a reduction in administrative burdens in the process of renegotiating contracts.

Overall, changes in the way the nation's military does business has saved the American taxpayer nearly four and a half billion dollars. But that is only a beginning. And in the months ahead, you can be sure that defense will not be equated with a blank check. Some in the Congress would like to make the military a scapegoat for their own failure to reduce federal spending. We won't let it become a scapegoat—but neither will we let it become wasteful.

Ultimately, of course, the defense of America rests in her factories and school rooms, as well as her missile silos and submarines. This Administration is committed body and soul to restoring our economic as well as military strength. We still have a ways to go. But look at the progress already made. Tonight, there are no Americans held hostage to foreign street mobs—or to double digit inflation here at home. Tonight, we're closer to an economy that is stimulated, not shackled, by Washington. Tonight, we're closer to a foreign policy that encourages American greatness instead of American retreat.

These economic gains are early harbingers of recovery, signs that have strong implications for future prosperity. And the return of American prosperity is the most compassionate program anyone can offer.

In the words of Thomas Paine, these are times that try men's souls. We need more than summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. If we believe in the principles of free enterprise that made our country great, we must stand up for them again, today. We must draw anew on the individual strength, ingenuity and vision that built America.

But our gaze is not set on the past. It is firmly fixed on tomorrow. We must not mortgage our children's future to pay for the mistakes of today. The choice before our generation is grave but clear: We must either face and solve our problems now or surrender to them forever.

We are not the only people at a crossroads. For many the requirement for courage and sacrifice is far greater. In Poland, where citizens must meet in secret to resist military tyranny, courageous workers still struggle underground. They have recently published a plea for continued resistance "so that our children do not have to be ashamed of us," so that our children, "will have a chance to grow up as free and courageous people."

You and I already enjoy that freedom, a freedom that must be defended as well as enjoyed. Our President has pledged to defend it at home and abroad. Together, we can, and must, honor that pledge. Our children deserve freedom. Our conscience demands it. Let history record that we responded positively to both.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.